

From:
To: [Sen Fagan](#); [Sen Girod](#); [Sen Golden](#); [Sen Knopp](#); [Sen MonnesAnderson](#); [Exhibits SHOUS](#)
Subject: SB 608 OPPOSE
Date: Thursday, January 31, 2019 12:20:15 PM

Dear Senators and Committee,

I am a 3rd generation Manufactured Home Community owner and operator that serves over 650 residents in Oregon and Washington. Our communities are 55+ communities that have been providing affordable housing to senior residents for over 30 years. These residents rely on us for a safe, secure and friendly community and we strive to provide that and make their housing affordable. With ongoing capital costs for new homes, asphalt, infrastructure and aggressive new over-regulation in the last few years, our business is almost being regulated right out of the market.

SB 608 will add unnecessary cost to our community operations and be a regulatory burden. This action will then cause significant reduction in the investment of current affordable housing. Please oppose rent control bills like this.

Rent control is bad for landlord AND tenants because:

Rent control decreases housing supply

- Housing units are lost from the supply when rent control is put in place.
- Developers will choose to build de-controlled new homes, condominiums, office buildings, or simply not to build at all, investing their funds elsewhere.
- Berkeley and Santa Monica both lost rental housing stock over the first decade of rent control. Berkeley lost 3,941 units (14%) and Santa Monica lost 2,443 (8%).
- In New York City between 1960 and 1967, the inventory of "sound" housing grew by 2.4 percent, but the "dilapidated" inventory grew by 44 percent and the "deteriorating" inventory grew by 37 percent.

Rent control decreases low income tenants

- Rent control hurts single mothers. Single mother households decreased in both Berkeley and Santa Monica by 24% and 27% respectively.
- Low-income tenants—including students, elderly, and disabled persons, and those receiving public assistance—have been displaced by people who can pay substantial "finder's fees" and who are more attractive as tenants.
- The number of low income households decreased in both Berkeley and Santa Monica while the number of high and very high-income households increased.

It reduces the quality/maintenance on properties affected

- A ceiling on rents reduces the quantity and quality of housing available. Landlords must let unit quality deteriorate to the point where the controlled rent is actually the market price, or they cannot afford the unit.
- Rent controls discourage new construction, cause abandonment, retard maintenance, reduce mobility, generate mismatch between housing units and tenants, exacerbate discrimination in rental housing, create black markets, encourage the conversion of rental to owner-occupied housing, and generally short-circuit the housing market.

Rent control decreases housing turnover and mis-allocates housing

- This creates an incentive to stay in the same apartment, which leads people to remain in the same apartment even if their tastes and conditions change.
- Tenants may apply for or remain settled in apartments that do not well suit their needs simply because the apartment carries a low price.

It increases unemployment and decreases worker mobility

- Decreases the mobility of the labor force by making tenants reluctant to move from a rent-controlled apartment.
- The inefficient use of time and resources associated with extended commutes, leads to a decline in the quality of job matches for residents.

Please OPPOSE SB 608 and support affordable housing in the Manufactured Housing community industry.

Thank you very much.

--

Casey Shen
casey@macsimslc.com